

II. REMARKS AND CONCLUSION

The Restriction Requirement dated June 22, 2007, has been received and carefully noted. The amendments made herein and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

By this Amendment, claims 1-6 are canceled, and new claims 7-12 have been added. Applicants note that the subject matter directed to vinyl acetate-vinyl alcohol copolymers is not present in the new claims. Support for the claims can be found in the specification and claims as originally filed (see, for example, specification, pages 7-8). Applicants submit that no new matter has been added.

The Office Action contains a Restriction Requirement under 35 USC §121 and §372. The Examiner has stated that Applicants are required to elect one of the following groups of claims for prosecution in this application:

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| Group I | Claims 1, 5 and 6, drawn to the use of a polyvinyl acetate |
| Group II | Claims 1, 5 and 6, drawn to the use of a copolymer of vinyl acetate-vinyl alcohol |
| Group III | Claim 2, drawn to a procedure for obtaining polyvinyl acetate |
| Group IV | Claim 3, drawn to a procedure for obtaining a vinyl acetate-vinyl alcohol copolymer |
| Group V | Claim 4, drawn to a process of forming a vinyl acetate powder |
| Group VI | Claim 4, drawn to a process of forming a vinyl acetate powder-vinyl alcohol copolymer |

Applicants hereby provisionally elect Group I, with traverse. Applicants submit that the Restriction Requirement requiring election between the inventions directed to vinyl acetate-vinyl alcohol copolymers (Groups II, IV, and VI) has been rendered moot, as this subject matter is not present in the current claims. Further, Applicants traverse the Restriction Requirement requiring election between Groups I, III, and V. Applicants submit that the present claims, which are directed to a product, process of manufacture, and a method of use relating to polyvinyl acetates, should not be subject to a Restriction Requirement. This argument is supported by the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), which states:

The method for determining unity of invention under PCT Rule 13 shall be construed as permitting, in particular, the inclusion of any one of the following combinations of claims of different categories in the international application:

(A) In addition to an independent claim for a given product, an independent claim for a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an independent claim for a use of the said product...

(MPEP §1850(III)(A)).

As such, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement.

In view of the Applicants' above elections, Applicants respectfully submit that the Restriction Requirement has been satisfied. Applicants submit that claims 7-12 read on the elected invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request examination of claims 7-12 on the merits.

Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment with respect to this paper to Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing Attorney Docket Number 024273-00001.

Respectfully submitted,



Yelee Y. Kim
Registration No. 60,088

ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339

Telephone No.: 202-857-6000
Facsimile No.: 202-857-6395

RJB/YYK:yyk

Enclosure: Petition for Four (4) Month Extension of Time